DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 250 622 CG 017 821

AUTHOR Endler, Norman S.; Edwards, Jean M.
TITLE Interactionism in Personality in the Twentieth Century. Research Report #146.
INSTITUTION York Univ., Downview (Ontario). Dept. of Psychology.
PUB DATE Aug 84
NOTE 14p.; Paper presented at a session on "Personality Theory through the Ages" at the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association (92nd, Toronto, Ontario, Canada, August 24-28, 1984).
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS History; *Interaction; *Models; *Personality Theories; Philosophy; State of the Art Reviews
IDENTIFIERS Consistency Theory; Situational Variables; Twentieth Century

ABSTRACT

This paper examines the historical development of the interaction model of personality in the 20th century. The philosophical roots of interactionism can be traced to the writings of Aristotle and Descartes. One of the earliest interactionist positions in psychology can be found in the works of Kantor (1924, 1926). Although theoretical interest in interactionism continued with Lewin (1935), Murray (1938) and Rotter (1954), early empirical research examining interactionism developed independently. The social, political, historical, and methodological factors that have influenced the research and theorizing on interactionism in personality are examined. Finally, the development of the interaction model of personality is traced to the evolution of major personality issues, including (1) the consistency-specifying controversy; (2) reformulation of definitions of consistency; (3) the distinction between mechanistic and dynamic interaction; and (4) the analysis of situations. (Author)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED250622

Interactionism in Personality in the Twentieth Century

Norman S. Endler and Jean M. Edwards
Department of Psychology
York University

August, 1984

Research Report #146

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
X Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Norman S. Endler
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Paper presented at a session on Personality Theory through the Ages (Division 26) at the American Psychological Association Annual Convention, Toronto, August 24-28, 1984.

CG 017821

Running Head: INTERACTIONISM IN THE 20th CENTURY

ABSTRACT

This paper examines the historical development of the interaction model of personality in the 20th century. The philosophical roots of interactionism can be traced to the writings of Aristotle and Descartes. One of the earliest interactionist positions in psychology can be found in the works of Kantor (1924, 1926). Although theoretical interest in interactionism continued with Lewin (1935), Murray (1938) and Rotter (1954), early empirical research examining interactionism developed independently. The social, political, historical, and methodological factors that have influenced the research and theorizing on interactionism in personality are examined.

Finally, the development of the interaction model of personality is traced to the evolution of major personality issues, including (1) the consistency - specifying controversy; (2) reformulation of definitions of consistency; (3) the distinction between mechanistic and dynamic interaction; and (4) the analysis of situations.

INTERACTIONISM IN PERSONALITY IN THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

The term personality evolved from the Latin persona, the mask worn in the classical theatre. The wearer of a specific mask could be expected to display a more or less consistent pattern of behavior and attitudes throughout the performance. The term later came to refer to the wearer of the mask as well (Burnham, 1968). The distinction between the mask definitions, which focused on the surface characteristics, and the substance definitions focusing on the inner core or personality, has survived in contemporary conceptualizations. There are currently numerous definitions of personality utilizing different constructs with the emphasis depending on the theoretical approach or model adopted. Hall and Lindzey (1978) in fact conclude that "The way given individuals will define personality will depend completely upon their theoretical preferences...personality is defined by the particular empirical concepts that are part of the theory of personality employed by the observer" (p. 9). Although trait and psychodynamic models predominated early definitions and theories of personality, there are important historical antecedents of the current interest in an interaction model of personality.

The concept of interactionism can be traced back to the time of Aristotle (see Shute, 1973), Descartes and other philosophers, and early examples of interactionist conceptualizations can be found in the physical sciences, i.e., Hooke's Law in the 17th century. Hooke's Law states that "within the elastic limit, strain is proportional to stress (Harris & Levey, 1975, p. 843). For fluids and gases elasticity has a different meaning. This means that the elasticity of a substance is an interactive function of the degree of situational stress, and the nature of the material. The empirical evidence summarized by Endler and Edwards (1978) indicates that there may well be a Hooke's Law for personality. Studies have shown that there is an interaction between personality traits (material) and situational impact (stress) for such behaviors as anxiousness, conformity and locus of control. Both situations and persons interact jointly to affect the direction and nature of behavior. Within psychology the first interactionist approach was probably that of Kantor (1924, 1926). He proposed that "no biological fact may be considered as anything but the mutual interaction of the organism and the environment" (1926, p. 369) and that the "unit of analysis should be the individual as he interacts with all of the various types of situations which constitute his behavior circumstances" (1924, p. 92). He was the first to distinguish between the physical and psychological environments. Lewinian theory, however, offers the most explicit theoretical formulation of person-environment interaction (Lewin, 1935). In his theorizing Lewin (1935) emphasized the relationship between the individual and his environment. The units of organization were holistic entities, and the various elements within the person-situation relationship were mutually interdependent and not independent. Kantor and Lewin both focused on the reciprocal interaction between the person and his or her enviornment. Murray (1938) postulated a need-press theory of personality, the essential characteristic of which was the interaction between person and situational

factors. "Since at every moment, an organism is within an environment which largely determines its behavior, and since the environment changes--sometimes with radical abruptness--the conduct of an individual cannot be formulated without a characterization of each confronting situation, physical and social" (Murray, 1983, p. 39). Murray used the parallel constructs of needs and presses for persons and environments, respectively, and this makes it possible to examine person by situation interactions within the theoretical context of his theory. Angyal (1941) believed that the person and situation formed an interdependent unit.Kantor and Lewin emphasized the interdependence of person variables and situation variables. Tolman (1935/1951) on the other hand regarded the various components as independent, and conceptualized behavior as being a function of the stimulus setup, heredity, training and physiological state of the organism. Murphy's (1947) biosocial theory of personality is essentially an interactional theory. Personality is a function of two factors, one within the biological organism, and one within the social environment. Although Murphy proposed an interactional view of personaltiy, he did not explicitly distinguish between the psychological environment and the physical enviornment.

Rotter (1954) in his social learning theory formulation of personality suggests that the unit of analysis for the study of personality should be the interaction of the person and his or her meaningful environment. Rotter's meaningful environment seems to be analogous to the psychological environment as proposed by Lewin and Murray. Jessor (1956, 1958) has also focused on the psychological environment and has aimed at relating this to phenomenological theories of personality. The psychological environment usually refers to the person's perception of a meaning of the situation.

Despite these early theoretical formulations of person-situation interactions, it was only in the late 1950's and early 1960's that empirical research on interactionism developed (see Endler & Hunt, 1966; Endler, Hunt & Rosenstein, 1962; Raush, Dittman & Taylor, 1959 a, b), and this development originally occurred independently of the earlier theoretical models. Controversy concerning the cross-situational consistency or stability of behavior, provoked in part by Mischel's 1968 personality book, generated renewed interest in this theoretical model (e.g., Endler, 1976; Endler, & Hunt 1969; Endler & Magnusson, 1976a, 1976b; Hunt, 1965; Magnusson & Endler, 1977, Raush, 1965), as well as extensive reviews of the empirical literature (e.g., Argyle & Little, 1972; Bowers, 1973; Ekehammar, 1974; Endler, 1976; Endler & Magnusson, 1976 a,b; Magnusson, 1976; Magnusson & Endler, 1977; Mischel, 1973).

What social, political, historical and methodological factors have influenced research and theorizing on interactionism in personality during the twentieth century? Ichheiser (1943) has discussed the role of sociopolitical factors in personality research. He suggests that the under estimation of situational factors in personality theorizing and research had its roots in the social system and ideology of nineteenth-century liberalism. The contention was that "our fate in social space depended exclusively, or at least predominantly, on our individual qualities--that we, as individuals, and not the prevailing social conditions shape our

lives" (Ichheiser, 1943, p. 152). Sociopolitical and sociopsychological factors since the 1930s (e.g., unemployment, the depression, World War II, the Cold War, the revolution of rising expectations, Viet Nam) changed the emphasis towards explaining behavior in terms of social conditions rather than in terms of personal factors. In the 1970s and early 1980s the pendulum swung in the direction of examining both personal and situational factors, and hence the rise of interactionism.

Methodology and research techniques, as well as applied psychology have all influenced research in personality. Feshbach and Weiner (1982) have pointed out that the development of intelligence testing had a profound influence on personality-assessment strategies. The Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI), the most widely used personality inventory, has generated an enormous amount of research and has been the model for the development of other personality inventories (Anastasi, 1976). Not only did these personality tests influence assessment strategies, but they also had a significant effect on the development of trait theories in the 1930s and 1940s. The correlational techniques and the advent of factor analysis also influenced and emphasized trait theories. Similarly, the growth of clinical psychology in the 1940s, 1950s, and 1960s, with its emphasis on the assessment and treatment of individuals had a direct influence on trait psychology (cf. Korchin, 1983; Watson, 1953).

On the other hand the development of experimental techniques, analysis of variance research designs and social learning theory influenced and increased the emphasis on situationism in personality (cf. Bandura, 1977; Skinner, 1938). Mischel's (1968) seminal personality book questioned the stability or consistency of behavior and hence the whole foundation of the trait theories.

Work on the variance components techniques (Endler, 1966) and on person by treatment experimental designs (Endler and Magnusson, 1976b) facilitated the research on interactionism. During the 1970s and early 1980s there were therefore numerous studies on various personality issues (e.g., consistency versus inconsistency, dynamic versus mechanistic interaction) in particular and on person by situation interactions in general.

Personal and subjective factors also affect the nature of personality theories. Stolorow and Atwood (1979) have pointed out that one determinant of a personality theory is the life experiences of the scientist postulating the theory. Pervin (1984) has noted that "The general public and many scientists have the view of science as a purely objective pursuit and the view of scientists as purely rational individuals. Yet, considerable evidence suggests that scientists are very much influenced by their personal histories and by the societal views of the time" (p. 289). Personal variables and experience have a more significant role in psychological theory and research than in the fields of chemistry and physics, because chemistry and physics are exact sciences and psychology is not. The role of personal factors is most marked in personality research where the ambiguity of the subject matter is most conducive for projection

on part of the investigator. The personality theorist and his field interact and this influences the content areas of the research under investigation (Endler, 1982). For example, one of the authors of this paper (Endler, 1982) became interested in interactional psychology because of his experiences as a head counsellor at a summer camp, and his training experiences as a clinical psychologist where he observed that people behaved differently in different situations; people affected situations and vice-versa.

The development of the interaction model of personality in the twentieth century can also be traced to the evolution of major personality issues, including (1) the consistency-specificity controversy (Endler and Magnusson, 1976b; Mischel, 1968); (2) reformulations of definitions of consistency (Mischel & Peake, 1982, Bem and Funder, 1978, Epstein, 1979, 1980, 1983 a,b); (3) the distinction between mechanistic and dynamic interaction (see Ekehammar, 1974; Endler & Edwards, 1978; Magnusson and Endler, 1977; Overton and Reese, 1973; Olweus, 1977); and (4) the analysis of situations within an interactional model (Edwards, 1984; Endler, 1981; Magnusson, 1971, 1981).

These have at least three different meanings of consistency; namely, absolute consistency (the view that an individual manifests a behavioral trait, such as anxiousness, to the same degree in various situations, a view that no one takes seriously); relative consistency (the view that the rank order of persons for a specific behavior is stable across situations; the basis for much of the specificity-consistency controversy); and coherence (the view that behavior is predictable and lawful and shows stable patterns) (Magnusson and Endler, 1977). Mischel and Peake (1982) have proposed that the term consistency should be used for cross-situational behaviors, with the term stability being reserved for longitudinal behaviors. They found little or no evidence for consistency, but some evidence for stability. In general, there is evidence for longitudinal consistency (Block, 1977), but very little evidence for cross-situational consistency, especially with respect to social and personal variables (Endler, 1982; Mischel, 1968; Mischel and Peake, 1982). When situations are dissimilar there is little evidence for cross-situational consistency; when they are similar, there is evidence for consistency (Magnusson, Gerzen & Nyman, 1968).

Mischel (1984) found convergent experimental and correlational evidence to support the notion of coherence over time (stability) and cross-situational discriminativeness (inconsistency). Discriminative facility rather than rigidity is characteristic of adaptive behavior. Mischel (1984) points out that historically there have been two different strategic approaches to consistency. The first strategy derived from the classic trait approach assumes that situations account for error variance, and attempts to minimize their effects by aggregating across them. For example, Epstein (1979) has tried to eliminate the impact of situations and to demonstrate consistent and stable individual differences. The second strategy assesses consistencies "by linking the behavior of interest to a circumscribed set of contexts, thus pursuing consistency on a more local and specific (rather than global) level" (Mischel, 1984, p. 359). Both

strategies have demonstrated only modest elevels of cross-situational consistency.

Three general strategies have been used to investigate interactions: namely, the variance components strategy, the correlational strategy and the person by treatment (situation) experimental design (Endler and Magnusson, 1976b). The variance components approach has demonstrated interactions but has not explained them. The correlational approach has found consistency for structural variables (e.g., abilities, cognitive competency), for similar situations, for longitudinal consistency, but little or no evidence for cross-situational consistency with respect to personal and social variables. The person by treatment designs have found interactions, especially with respect to anxiety, and these have been explained within the context of an interaction model of anxiety (Endler, 1980, 1983).

The person by treatment designs have focus on a mechanistic model of interaction, which examines the joint effects of person and situation variables on behavior (Endler, 1983). Unfortunately, this does not assess the dynamic process of interaction, which is characteric of most human behavior. What is needed is a dynamic, process-oriented model which examines the effects of persons on situations and vice versa; the effects of both persons and situations on behavior; and the effects of behavior on both persons and situations. As Endler (1983) states "We are dealing with static snapshots rather than movies. Unless and until interactionism enables us to explain the process of interaction, it will be a model but not yet a theory" (p. 192).

There have been recent attempts at new methodologies and at reformulating the consistency issues in particular, and interactionism in general, in terms of reconceptualizations of personality. Epstein (1979) has proposed aggregation of behavior across situations as a method for improving consistency, an approach that Mischel and Peake (1982) term the reliability solution. Bem and Allen (1974), and Bem and Funder (1978) have proposed template matching and idiographic solutions to the consistency problem. All these approaches have certain limitations with respect to reconceptualization of personality. Cantor & Mischel (1979) have discussed prototypes or prototypical behavior, Buss and Craik (1983) have discussed traits in terms of frequencies of acts, and Endler and Magnusson (1976b), Magnusson and Endler (1977) and Raush (1977) have discussed the need to study the coherence of person-situation interactions.

Promising strategies for analyzing situations are currently being explored; see for example Pervin's modified free response studies (1977, 1981, 1983), Cantor and Mischel's work with prototypes (Cantor, 1981; Cantor & Mischel, 1979; Cantor, Mischel & Schwartz, 1982), Forgas' studies using multidimensional scaling (1979; 1982) and Magnusson's systematic examinations of situations (Magnusson, 1980; Magnusson & Stattin, 1981).

Innovative research focusing on other aspects of interaction process have also been proposed. Mischel (1973) suggested focusing on encoding and decoding strategies. Similarly, Argyle (1977) proposed analyzing the

generative rules of social interactions rather than attempting to make predictions about content. Longitudinal studies (see Block, 1971, 1977) and intensive case studies may also be useful. The most pressing challenges are to develop appropriate units of analyses for studying situations and persons-in-situations, and paradigms for examining the dynamic interaction process.

References

Anastasi, A. (1976). Psychological testing. (4th ed.). New York: Macmillan.

Angyal, A. (1941). Foundations for a science of personality. Cambridge,: Harvard University Press.

Argyle, M. (1977). Predictive and generative rules models of P x S interaction. In D. Magnusson & N. S. Endler (Eds.), Personality at the crossroads: Current issues in interactional psychology. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Argyle, M. & Little, B. R. (1972). Do personality traits apply to social behavior? Journal of Theory and Social Behavior, 2, 1-35.

Bandura, A. (1977). Social learning theory. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Bem, D. J. & Allen, A. (1974). On predicting some of the people some of the time: The search for cross-situational consistencies in behavior. Psychological Review, 81, 506-520.

Bem, D. J. & Funder, D. C. (1978). Predicting more of the people more of the time: Assessing the personality of situations. Psychological Review, 85, 485-502.

Block, J. (1971). Lives through time. Berkeley, Calif.: Bancroft.

Block, J. (1977). Advancing the psychology of personality: Paradigmatic shift or improving the quality of research. In D. Magnusson & N. S. Endler (Eds.), Personality at the crossroads: Current issues in interactional psychology. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Bowers, K. S. (1973). Situationism in psychology: An analysis and a critique. Psychological Review, 80, 307-336.

Burnham, J. C. (1968). Historical background for the study of personality. In E. F. Borgatta & W. W. Lambert (Eds.), Handbook of personality theory and research. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Buss, D. M. & Craik, K. H. (1983). The act frequency approach to personality. Psychological Review, 90, 105-126.

Cantor, N. (1981). Perceptions of situations: Situational prototypes and person-situation prototypes. In D. Magnusson (Ed.), Toward a psychology of situations: An interactional perspective. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Cantor, N. & Mischel, W. (1979). Prototypes in person perception. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), Advances in experimental social psychology. New York: Academic Press.

Cantor, N., Mischel, W., & Schwartz, J. C. (1982). A prototype analysis of psychological situations. Cognitive Psychology, 14, 45-77.

Edwards, J. M. (1984). Situational determinants of behavior. In N. S. Endler & J. McV. Hunt (Eds.), Personality and the behavioral disorders (2nd ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Ekehammar, B. (1974). Interactionism in personality from a historical perspective. Psychological Bulletin, 81, 1,026-1,048.

Endler, N. S. (1966). Estimating variance components for mean squares from random and mixed effects analysis of variance models. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 22, 559-570.

Endler, N. S. (1976). Grand illusions: Traits or interactions? Canadian Psychological Review, 1, 174-181.

Endler, N. S. (1980). Person-situation interaction and anxiety. In I. L. Kutash & L. B. Schlesinger (Eds.), Handbook of stress and anxiety: Contemporary knowledge, theory and treatment. San Fransisco: Jossey-Bass.

Endler, N. S. (1981). Situational aspects of interactional psychology. In D. Magnusson (Ed.), Toward a psychology of situations: An interactional perspective. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Endler, N. S. (1982). Interactionism comes of age. In M. P. Zanna, E. T. Higgins, & C. P. Herman (Eds.), Consistency in social behavior: The Ontario Symposium. Vol. 2. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Endler, N. S. (1983). Interactionism: A personality model, but not yet a theory. In M. M. Page (Ed.), Nebraska Symposium on Motivation 1982: Personality--Current theory and research. Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press.

Endler, N. S. & Edwards, J. (1978). Person by treatment interactions in personality research. In L. A. Pervin & M. Lewis (Eds.), Perspectives in interactional psychology. New York: Plenum.

Endler, N. S. & Hunt, J. M. (1966). Sources of behavioral variance as measured by the S-R Inventory of Anxiousness. Psychological Bulletin, 65, 336-346.

Endler, N. S. & Hunt, J. M. (1969). Generalizability of contributions from sources of variance in the S-R Inventory of Anxiousness. Journal of Personality, 37, 1-24.

Endler, N. S., Hunt, J. M., & Rosenstein, A. J. (1962). An S-R Inventory of Anxiousness. Psychological Monographs, 76(17) (Whole no. 536), 133.

Endler, N. S. & Magnusson, D. (1976a). Personality and person by situation interactions. In N. S. Endler & D. Magnusson (Eds.), Interactional psychology and personality. Washington, DC: Hemisphere.

Endler, N. S. & Magnusson, D. (1976b). Toward an interactional psychology of personality. Psychological Bulletin, 83, 956-974.

Endler, N. S. & Magnusson D. (1977). The interaction model of anxiety: An empirical test in an examination situation. Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science, 9, 101-107.

Epstein, S. (1979). The stability of behavior: I. On predicting most of the people much of the time. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37, 1,097-1,126.

Epstein, S. (1980). The stability of behavior, II: Implications of psychological research. American Psychologist, 35, 790-806.

Epstein, S. (1983a). Aggregation and beyond: Some basic issues on the prediction of behavior. Journal of Personality, 51, 360-392.

Epstein, S. (1983b). The stability of confusion: A reply to Mischel and Peake. Psychological Review, 90, 179-184.

Feshbach, S. & Weiner, B. (1982). Personality. Toronto: D. C. Heath.

Forgas, J. P. (1979). Social episodes: The study of interaction routines. Toronto: Academic Press.

Forgas, J. P. (1982). Episode cognition: Internal representation of interaction routines. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), Advances in experimental psychology. (Vol. 15). Toronto: Academic Press.

Hall, C. S. & Lindzey, G. (1978). Theories of personality. (3rd ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Harris, W. H. & Levey, J. S. (Eds.), (1975). The new Columbia encylopedia (4th ed.). New York: Columbia University Press.

Ichheiser, G. (1943). Misinterpretations of personality in everyday life and the psychologist's frame of reference. Character and Personality, 12, 145-160.

Jessor, R. (1956). Phenomenological personality theories and the data language of psychology. Psychological Review, 63, 173-180.

Jessor, R. (1958). The problem of reductionism in psychology. Psychological Review, 65, 170-178.

Kantor, J. R. (1924). Principles of psychology, Vol. 1. Bloomington, Ill.: Principia Press.

Kantor, J. R. (1926). Principles of psychology, Vol. 2. Bloomington, Ill.: Principia Press.

Korchin, S. J. (1983). The history of clinical psychology: A personal view. In H. Hersen, A. E. Kazdin & A. S. Bellack (Eds.), The clinical psychology handbook. New York: Pergamon Press.

Lewin, K. (1935). A dynamic theory of personality. Selected papers. New York: McGraw Hill.

Magnusson, D. (1971). An analysis of situational dimensions. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 32, 851-867.

Magnusson, D. (1976). The person and the situation in an interactional model of behavior. Scandinavian Journal of Psychology, 17, 253-271.

Magnusson, D. (1980). Situational effects in empirical personality research. Reports from the Department of Psychology, University of Stockholm. (No. 565). Stockholm.

Magnusson, D. (1981) (Ed.). Toward a psychology of situations: An interactional perspective. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Magnusson, D. & Ekehammar, B. (1973). An anlaysis of situational dimensions: A replication. Multivariate Behavioral Research, 8, 331-339.

Magnusson, D. & Endler, N. S. (1977). Interactional psychology: Present status and future prospects. In D. Magnusson & N. S. Endler (Eds.), Personality at the crossroads: Current issues in interactional psychology. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Magnusson, D., Gerzen, M. & Nyman, B. (1968). The generality of behavioral data: I. Generalization from observation or one occasion. Multivariate Behavioral Research, 3, 295-320.

Magnusson, D. & Stattin, H. (1981). Situational-outcome contingencies: A conceptual and empirical analysis of threatening situations. Reports from the Department of Psychology, University of Stockholm, (No. 571).

Mischel, W. (1968). Personality and assessment. New York: Wiley.

Mischel, W. (1973). Toward a cognitive social learning reconceptualization of personality. Psychological Review, 80, 252-283.

Mischel, W. (1984). Convergences and challenges in the search for consistency. American Psychologist, 39, 351-364.

Mischel, W. & Peake, P. K. (1982). Beyond Deja Vu in the Search for Cross-situational consistency. Psychological Review, 89, 730-755.

Murphy, G. (1947). Personality: A biosocial approach to origins and structure. New York: Harper.

Murray, H. A. (1938). Explorations in personality. New York: Oxford University Press.

Olweus, D. (1977). A critical analysis of the modern interactionist position. In D. Magnusson & N. S. Endler (Eds.), Personality at the crossroads: Current issues in interactional psychology. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Overton, W. F. & Reese, H. W. (1973). Models of development: Methodological implications. In J. R. Nesselroade & H. W. Reese (Eds.), Life span developmental psychology: Methodological issues. New York: Academic Press.

Pervin, L. A. (1977). The representative design of person-situation research. In D. Magnusson & N. S. Endler (Eds.), Personality at the crossroads: Current issues in interactional psychology. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Pervin, L. A. (1981). The relation of situations to behavior. In D. Magnusson (Ed.), Toward a psychology of situations: An interactional perspective. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Pervin, L. A. (1983). The stasis and flow of behavior: Toward a theory of goals. In M. M. Page (Ed.), Nebraska Symposium of Motivation-1982. Personality-Current theory and research. Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press.

Pervin, L. A. (1984). Current controversies and issues in personality (2nd ed.). New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Raush, H. L. (1965). Interaction sequences. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 2, 487-499.

Raush, H. L. (1977). Paradox, levels, and junctures in person-situation systems. In D. Magnusson & N. S. Endler (Eds.), Personality at the crossroads: Current issues in interactional psychology. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Raush, H. L., Dittman, A. T., & Taylor, T. J. (1959a). The interpersonal behavior of children in residential treatment. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58, 9-26.

Raush, H. L., Dittmann, A. T., & Taylor, T. J. (1959b). Person, setting and change in social interaction. Human Relations, 12, 361-378.

Rotter, J. B. (1954). Social learning and clinical psychology. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Shute, C. (1973). Aristotle's interactionism and its transformation by some 20th century writers. Psychological Record, 23, 283-293.

Skinner, B. F. (1938). The behavior of organisms. New York: Appleton Century Crofts.

Stolorow, R. D. & Atwood, G. E. (1979). Faces in a cloud: Subjectivity in personality theory. New York: Jason Aaronson.

Tolman, E. C. (1951). Psychology versus immediate experience. In E. C. Tolman, Collected papers in psychology. Berkeley: University of California Press (Reprinted from Philosophy of Science, 1935, 2, 356-380).

Watson, R. I. (1953). A brief history of clinical psychology. Psychological Bulletin, 50, 321-346.